

## REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 remain pending, with claims 1 and 7 independent. Claims 1-6 stand withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a restricted, non-elected invention. Claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 7, 10, and 16 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure, including, for example, in Figure 8, and at page 28, lines 14-19 and page 28, line 23 - page 29, line 5 of the specification . Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amendments do not include new matter.

Claims 7, 10, and 14 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,309) in view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,378). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Yoshida et al. and Clerc et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,813,770). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Yoshida et al., Clerc et al., and Ono et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,001). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Yoshida et al. and Ono et al. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Yoshida et al., and Hall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,494). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Yoshida et al. and Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,543).

The rejections are respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejections, independent claim 7 has been amended to clarify features of the invention that

are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. To this end, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 7 recites a color display apparatus that includes, among other things, three first subpixels and three second subpixels, with each of the first subpixels having a color filter of a color selected from three colors of yellow, magenta, and cyan, and each of the second subpixels having a color filter of a second color selected from three colors of red, green, and blue so as to generate a display state of the pixel by an additive color mixture of the first subpixels and the second subpixels. The claimed apparatus is configured such that the three first subpixels and the three second subpixels are disposed in the same plane.

The Office Action cites Takamatsu as disclosing features of the invention. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Takamatsu discloses a first group of subpixels in the form of electrodes 1-21, 1-22, and 1-23, and a second group of subpixels in the form of electrodes 1-18, 1-19, and 20.

Applicants submit, however, that Takamatsu does not disclose or suggest a configuration wherein three first subpixels and three second subpixels are disposed in the same plane, as recited in the claimed invention. For example, as shown in Figure 1 of Takamatsu, the electrodes 1-18, 1-19, and 1-20 are associated as one cell 1-4, and the electrodes 1-21, 1-22, and 1-23 are associated as a second cell 1-5, with the two cells in different planes of the device.

Applicants further submit that the secondary citations to Yoshida et al., Clerc et al., Ono et al., and Hall fail to cure the deficiencies of Takamatsu. The secondary references are cited in the Office Action as disclosing various features of the invention. None of these references disclose the combination of claimed features. Further, even if the secondary references are taken

in combination with Takamatsu, the total teachings of the references would not suggest the claimed configuration, given Takamatsu's clear teaching of configuration of pixels that is different than the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the references cited in the Office Action.

Applicants further submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the Office Action, and a Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. Office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

---

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200